

S/N 10/597660

In response to the Office Action dated May 26, 2010

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2, 7 and 15 have been amended and are supported in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0042]. No new matter is added.

35 USC § 112 Rejections

Claims 2-3, 7-8 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The rejection questions what a communication line interface is and whether it is a software or hardware component. The communication line interfaces transmit and receive the image data and are connected to a communication line such as an internet and a LAN (paragraph [0040]). It is well known to those skilled in the art that a communication line interface can be an electronic device that allows one piece of equipment to communicate with another piece of equipment. Thus, the communication line interface is hardware, e.g. Ethernet repeaters, wireless LAN interface cards, USB connections, Bluetooth adapters, etc. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

Claims 2-3, 7-8 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cameron et al. (JP 2002-282251) in view of Jorgensen et al. (US 2003/0067903). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2, 7 and 15 are directed to a remote ultrasonic diagnostic examiner-side apparatus having a communication line interface that receives, during a live mode, an ultrasonic image data in real time that is transmitted via a communication line, and requests, during a mode after freezing, a communication line interface of the subject-side apparatus to retransmit a frame to be reproduced via the communication line. During the mode after freezing, the ultrasonic image displayed by the display means is frozen to be a still state, and the request to the communication line interface of the subject-side apparatus to retransmit a frame occurs every time when a frame to be reproduced is designated by moving a pointer.

S/N 10/597660

In response to the Office Action dated May 26, 2010

Claims 2, 7 and 15 specifically require the cine-memory reproduction function in the mode after freezing. And, for clarification, the feature "the ultrasonic image displayed by the display means is frozen to be a still state, and the request to the communication line interface of the subject-side apparatus to retransmit a frame occurs every time when a frame to be reproduced is designated by moving a pointer" is separated from the feature "requests, during a mode after freezing, a communication line interface of the subject-side apparatus to retransmit a frame to be reproduced via the communication line" and is further revised to mention a function of freezing mode specifically.

As noted in the rejection, Cameron does not explicitly disclose transmitting data in real-time and receiving retransmitting frame/packet upon request (page 3 of the Office Action).

The rejection cites Jorgensen as disclosing a system that requests the retransmission of a packet via the communication line. However, the retransmission is performed in real time which is different from the invention of claims 2, 7 and 15 in which retransmission is requested for a mode after freezing where a still image is displayed. For a cine-memory reproduction after the freezing, a very low transfer rate is necessary for retransmitting request frame data, compared to a live mode reproduction as would be required in Jorgensen. Therefore, even if a speed of the communication line is insufficient for transmission in a live mode in real time, as in Jorgensen, it is sufficient for retransmitting a frame in a mode after freezing via a communication line, as in the present invention (paragraph [0043]).

Further, Jorgensen fails to teach that the examiner-side apparatus requests to retransmit a frame every time when a frame to be reproduced is designated by moving a pointer as recited in claims 2, 7 and 15. In Jorgensen, all of the lost packets are retransmitted. In the present invention, the request to retransmit the frames that are missing from the frames which were transmitted during the live mode are limited to those frames that are designated by moving a pointer. Thus, according to the present invention, efficient retransmission is performed without unnecessary operations.

S/N 10/597660

In response to the Office Action dated May 26, 2010

Therefore, Cameron does not teach or suggest the features of claims 2, 7 and 15 and the deficiencies of Cameron are not remedied by Jorgensen. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 8 and 16 allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependence on independent claims 2, 7 and 15. The rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Dated: August 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/llf